UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/818,134	03/27/2001	Sabin Belu	RN058 (2635-019-03)	8657

72455 7590 07/06/2009

Graybeal Jackson Haley c/o RealNetworks
Graybeal Jackson Haley LLP
155 - 108th Ave NE Suite 350
Bellevue, WA 98004-5973

EXAMINER	
CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/818,134	BELU, SABIN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 March 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *27 March 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-34 are pending in this application.

2. Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment to claims 1-5, 10,22, 24-26,31-32 filed on 3/24/2009.

3. Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment filed on 8/25/2008.

4. Examiner acknowledges applicant's "supplemental declaration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.131 filed on 8/25/2008.

Drawings

5. The Drawings filed on 3/27/2001 are acceptable for examination purpose

35 USC § 112

6. In view of applicant amendment to claims 5,, 24, the rejection under 35 USC 112 as set forth in the previous office action is hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As set forth in MPEP 2106(II)A:

Identify and understand Any Practical Application Asserted for the Invention The claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result." State

Street, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47USPQ2d at 1601-02. The purpose of this requirement is to limit patent protection to inventions that possess a certain level of "real world" value, as opposed to subject matter that represents nothing more than an idea or concept, or is simply a starting point for future investigation or research (Brenner v. Manson, 383 U.S. 519, 528-36, 148 USPQ 689, 693-96); In re Ziegler, 992, F.2d 1197, 1200-03, 26 USPQ2d 1600, 1603-06 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). Accordingly, a complete disclosure should contain some indication of the practical application for the claimed invention, i.e., why the applicant believes the claimed invention is useful.

Apart from the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101, usefulness under the patent eligibility standard requires significant functionality to be present to satisfy the useful result aspect of the practical application requirement. See Arrhythmia, 958 F.2d at 1057, 22 USPQ2d at 1036. Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material ***stored in a computer-readable medium does not make the invention eligible for patenting****. For example, a claim directed to a word processing* ***file stored on a disk may satisfy the utility*** *requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101 since the information stored may have some* ***"real world"*** *value. However, the mere fact that the claim may satisfy the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101* ***does not mean that a useful result is achieved under the practical application requirement****.* ***The claimed invention as a whole must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible" result to have a practical application***

8. The claim 25, lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material per se.

On page 9, lines 24-28 of the specification applicant has provided evidence that applicant intends computer readable medium in claim 25 to include transmission type media, such as signal, as such the claim is drawn to a form of energy. Energy is not one of the four categories of invention and therefore the claim(s) is/are not statutory. Energy is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. Energy is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Energy is not combination of substances and therefor not a composition of matter.

For "General Analysis for Determining Patent-Eligible Subject Matter", see 101 Interim Guidelines as indicated below:

<<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/ogsheet.html>>

see MPEP 8th edition, Rev 7, July 2008

No new matter should be entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. ***Claims 1-10, 20, 24, 26, 27, 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Halpern et al. [hereafter Halpen], US Patent No. 6282711 filed on Aug 10, 1999***.

11. As to Claim 1, Halpern teaches a system which including ' a method for creating, in response to only a single action by a user enabled electronic device a self-extracting file [col 1, line 36-37, col 4, line 57-61, line 66-67, col 5, line 6-7, col 6, line 19-22, line 47-52, fig 1], Halpen teaches user interface allows users to select required program in a "single action" for example "double click [col 1, line 36-37] is common knowledge in the art, further Halpen also specifically teaches "self-extracting" executable programs and data files as detailed in col 6, line 47-52;

receiving from the user enabled electronic device,[col 5, line 41-44, fig 1] an input file to be used in creating a self-extracting file [col 6, line 47-52], self-extracting file corresponds to Halpen's self-extracting executable programs and data files as detailed in col 6, line 47-52;

without further action by the user enabled electronic device, [col 3, line 42-49], Halpen specifically teaches dynamically producing required software installation files particularly via user interface template as detailed in fig 1, col 3, line 42-49]; ' creating a self-extracting file using the input file, wherein the input file is configured to be automatically launched upon execution of the self-extracting file' [Abstract, line 23-25, col 3, line 62-67, col 4, line 1-5, col 6, line 47-52], Halpen specifically teaches "auto-launch" or "auto-start" feature for installation the selected program applications and files.

12. As to Claim 2, Halpern disclosed wherein the received input file has an associated filename and wherein a filename for the self-extracting file is configured to be automatically generated based in part on the associated filename of the received input file [Abstract, line 21-25, col 1, line 41-44,col 3, line 62-67, col 12, line 46-50, col 6, line 47-50].

13. The limitations of claims 10, 20, 26 and 32 are rejected in the analysis of Claim 1 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

14. As to Claim 3, Halpern teaches a system which including 'a method for creating, in response to a single action [col 3, line 1-4], single action corresponds to in response to the user's input; ' a self-extracting file from an associated input file, wherein the associated input file is automatically launched upon execution of the self-extracting file [Abstract, line 23-25, col 3, line 62-67,

col 4, line 1-5, col 6, line 47-52], Halpen specifically teaches “auto-launch” or “auto-start” feature for installation the selected program applications and files, self-extracting file corresponds to Halpen’s self-extracting executable programs and data files as detailed in col 6, line 47-52;

‘ and wherein a user is not required to separately choose a data compression method [col 7, line 39-45], Halpern specifically teaches “compression process” of files to create a compressed installation as detailed in col 7, line 39-45]; ‘ create a compressed archive using the chosen compression method’ [col 1, line 33-39], Halpern specifically teaches both compression and decompression of files particularly with respect to self-extracting of files using PKUNZIP process, further as best understood by the examiner, "PKUNZIP" corresponds to compression/archive program and therefore “compressed archive using the compression method” is integral part of Halpern’s teaching, also it is noted that PKUNZIPis a “software” tool for compression/archiving files; ‘select an input file to be launched upon decompression of the compressed archive, and create a self-extracting file from the compressed archive, the method comprising [col 1, line 33-39, col 4, line 9-12, col 7, line 39-41]

receiving an input file to be used in creating a self-extracting file [col 3, line 1-4, line 62-67], Halpern specifically teaches user interface, where user selecting or inputting required installation of package containing files and/programs, particularly self-extracting files, ‘wherein the file is one of a plurality of file types’ [col 1, line 41-44, col 2, line 28-30], plurality of files corresponds to setup.exe or install.exe files are part of Windows NT or Unix file system

in response to only a single action[col 1, line 36-37] "single action" for example "double click is common knowledge in the art, creating a self-extracting file from the input file, wherein the input file is configured to be automatically launched upon execution of the self-extracting file [Abstract, line 23-25, col 3, line 62-67, col 4, line 1-5, col 6, line 47-52], Halpen specifically teaches "auto-launch" or "auto-start" feature for installation the selected program applications and files; self-extracting file corresponds to Halpen's self-extracting executable programs and data files as detailed in col 6, line 47-52.

15. As to Claim 4, Halpern disclosed ' wherein the single action is a single click with a computer pointing device' [col 1, line 33-37, col 4, line 66-67, col 5, line 1-7], Halpern specifically teaches user interface that allows users to select required options

16. As to Claim 5, Halpern disclosed 'wherein the single action is a double click with a computer pointing device' [col 1, line 33-37]

17. As to Claims 6-7, Halpern disclosed single action is speaking a sound, pressing a key '[col 3, line 1-7, col 4, line 66-67, fig 1].

18. As to Claim 8, Halpern disclosed 'wherein the single action is a call from a software routine' [col 3, line 37-38].

19. As to Claim 9, Halpern disclosed 'further comprising generating a filename for the self-extracting file , wherein the generated filename is based on a filename associated with the input file [col 1, line 25-44, col 2, line 28-29, col 6, line 47-50, fig 1].

20. The limitations of claim 24 are rejected in the analysis of claim 3 above, and the claim 24 is rejected on that basis.

21. As the Claim 27, the limitations of claim 27 are similar to the limitations of claim 1 above. Halpern further teaches the executable file includes a compressed copy of the input file, and wherein the compressed copy of the input file is automatically decompressed [col 1, line 33-44, col 3, line 62-67, col 4, line 1-2, line 9-12]. Therefore, the limitations of claim 27 are rejected in the analysis of Claim 1 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

22. The limitations of claim 31 are rejected in the analysis of claim 27above, and the claim 31 is rejected on that basis.

23. As to Claim 33, Halpen disclosed 'wherein the input file is an executable routine and wherein a function of the executable routine is called upon loading of the executable routine [col 1, line 41-44]

24. ***Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wygodny et al. [hereafter Wygodny], US Patent No. 6202199 based on provisional application No. 60/055,165 filed on July 31,1997.***

25. As to Claim 21, Wygodny teaches a system which including ' a method of creating a self-extracting file' [col 16, line 41-44], self-extracting file corresponds to Wygodny's self-extracting file;

displaying a first frame used to allow a user to specify an input file to be converted to a self-extracting file [col 8, line 51-55, col 17, line 1-7, fig 3A, fig 9-10], displaying a first frame corresponds to Wygodny's fig 3A, frame window 300 split frame having four panes is part of the user interface, further Wygodny also teaches user selecting specific file from the file menu or dialog box as detailed in col 17, line 1-7;

receiving the input file specified by the user, wherein the received input file is automatically configured as a self-extracting file, and wherein the input file is automatically launched upon execution of the self-extracting file [col 17, line 1-12, line 21-23, line 33-41, line 43-47, fig 10-11]; Wygodny specifically teaches user interface allows to select required file from the file list as detailed in fig 10-11

displaying a second frame, [fig 3A-3B, fig 5] wherein the second frame includes a link related to the self-extracting file created from the user specified input file [col 17, line 1-7, line 49-56], displaying a second frame corresponds to Wygodny's fig 3A

26. As to Claim 22, Wygodny teaches a system which including 'system for creating a self-extracting file [col 16, line 41-44], self-extracting file corresponds to Wygodny's self-extracting file;

a receiving module configured to receive an input file, wherein the input file received is one of a plurality of file types and wherein the input file includes an associated filename [col 9, line 9-13, line 57-62, col 12, line 24-35], input files and file names corresponds to executable files shown in the display window as detailed in fig 3A, element 314;

a naming module configured to create and name an output file, wherein the output filename is generated from the associated filename of the input file [col 7, line 12-15], Wygodny specifically teaches file input/output operations; 'and wherein the naming module receives the input file from the receiving module' [col 10, line 63-67]

a self-extracting module configured to transform the output file into a executable file, wherein the self-extracting module receives the input file and the output file from the naming module [col 16, line 39-44];

a loader module configured to setup the executable file to launch the input file upon execution of the executable file, wherein the loader module receives the executable file and the input file from the self-extracting module [col 9, line 9-13, line 57-62, col 12, line 24-35, line 44-46, col 17, line 43-53, fig 10];

a compressing module configured to compress the input file and attach the compressed input file to the executable file, wherein the compressing module receives the input file and the executable file from the loader module [col 16, line

39-44, col 17, line 43-53, fig 10]; wherein each module is embodied in hardware, in firmware, or in a collection of software instructions stored in a tangible computer-readable medium" [col 5, line 6-17, col 6, line 56-67].

27. As to Claim 23, Wygodny specifically teaches 'wherein the loader module is further configured to setup the executable file to perform unload processes' [col 5, line 65-67, col 6, line 1-10].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

28. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

29. ***Claims 11-19,25,28-29, 30, 34, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halpern et al. [hereafter Halpen], US Patent No. 6282711 filed on Aug 10,1999 as applied to claim 10, 32, above, and further in view of Gage et al. [hereafter Gage], US Patent No. 5923846 published on July 13, 1999***.

30. As to Claim 11, Halpern disclosed wherein the creation of the self-extracting file opening an output file [col 6, line 47-52], self-extracting file corresponds to Halpen's self-extracting executable programs and data files as

detailed in col 6, line 47-52;

attaching a decompression engine to the output file, wherein the decompression engine is capable of decompressing compressed data' [col 4, line 9-12]

attaching a loader to the output file, wherein the loader configures the output file so as to automatically launch, after execution of the self-extracting file [Abstract, line 23-25, col 3, line 62-67, col 4, line 1-5, col 6, line 47-52], Halpen specifically teaches "auto-launch" or "auto-start" feature for installation the selected program applications and files, self-extracting file corresponds to Halpen's self-extracting executable programs and data files as detailed in col 6, line 47-52;

'compressing the received input file according to a data compression method; attaching an archive including information about the compressed input file [col 1, line 33-39], Halpern specifically teaches both compression and decompression of files particularly with respect to self-extracting of files using PKUNZIP process, further as best understood by the examiner, "PKUNZIP" corresponds to compression/archive program and therefore "compressed archive using the compression method" is integral part of Halpern's teaching, also it is noted that PKUNZIPis a "software" tool for compression/archiving files

closing the output file, wherein the closed output file is the self- extracting file [col 6, line 19-22, line 54-60].

It is however, noted that Halpern does not specifically teach "temporary files", "archive header" On the other hand, Gage disclosed 'temporary files" [col

11, line 61-67, col 12, line 1-4, fig 3-4], Gage specifically teaches source files are copied , and compressed into the temporary files as detailed in col 11, line 62-64; "archive header [fig 5, col 14, line 21-25, line 34-41], Gage specifically teaches header data structure information including compressed file format as detailed in col 14, line 34-41.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of uploading/downloading files on a computer network of Gage et al. into user initiating the installation of software via distributed processing network of Halpern et al because both Halpern, Gage specifically teaches compression and decompression process particularly, using PKZ*IP* [Halpern: col 1, line 33-39; Gage: col 10, line 45-50, col 12, line 1-4], both Halpern, Gage specifically directed to "distributed processing network ' [Halpern: fig 1; Gage: fig 1]. Therefore, based on Halpern, in view of Gage, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Gage to the system of Halpern in order to provide temporary files during automatic file compression thereby increase the speed of uploading files in the distributed processing network, thus improving the quality and reliability of the system.

31. As to Claim 12, Halpern disclosed 'wherein the input file is received from a user enabled electronic device [fig 1].

32. As to Claim 13, Halpern disclosed 'wherein the input file is received from a software routine [col 2, line 66-67, col 3, line 1].

33. As to Claim 14-15, Halpern disclosed 'wherein the data compression method is the same method for all received input files [col 6, line 11-14].

34. As to Claim 16, Halpern disclosed 'wherein the loader attached to the output file depends on the file type of the input file [col 1, line 41-44, line 61-65].

35. As to Claim 17, Gage disclosed 'wherein the loader automatically unloads the temporary file' col 12, line 16-18].

36. As to Claim 18, Gage disclosed 'comprising attaching an unloader to the output file to automatically unload the temporary file' [col 9, line 61-65].

37. As to Claim 19, Gage disclosed 'wherein the unloader performs cleanup processes on the temporary file [col 14, line 57-60, col 15, line 5-8].

38. The limitations of claims 25 and 30 are rejected in the analysis of claims 10-11 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis, further Halpern specifically teaches "PKUNZIP" compression/decompression related to files [col 1, line 33-41], and a loader operable to launch the decompressed input data portion with appropriate application software for handling the input data file [col 1, line 39-44]. Therefore, based on Halpern in view of Gage, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Gage to the system for archive header to include

compressed file information in order to provide or display respective message to the user.

39. As to Claim 28, Halpern disclosed the packing and unpacking processes are done without any user intervention [see Abstract, col 6, line 1-10, line 17-22]. This teaches the packing and unpackaging processes being done. Therefore, the limitations of claim 28 are rejected in the analysis of claims 10-11 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis. Therefore, based on Halpern in view of Gage, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Gage to the system for archive header to include compressed file information in order to provide or display respective message to the user.

40. The limitations of claim 29 are rejected in the analysis of claim 28 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

41. As to Claim 34, Gage disclosed ' wherein the input file is a dynamic link library file' [col 8, line 25-27]. Therefore, based on Halpern, in view of Gage, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Gage to the system of Halpern in order to provide temporary files during automatic file compression thereby increase the speed of uploading files in the distributed processing network, thus improving the quality and reliability of the system

Response to Arguments

42. Applicant's arguments filed 3/24/2009 with respect to claims 1-34 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, for examiner's response, see discussion below:

a) At page 12,-13, claim 1, applicant argues "In contrast, Halpern does not disclose receiving, from a user enabled electronic device, an input file to be used in creating a self-extracting file. Halperan also does not disclose creating a self-extracting file using the input file without further action by the user-enabled electronic device.

As to be above argument [a], examiner disagree with the applicant because firstly, Halpern is directed to installing software components from a remote server source, particularly, instillation of the selected application and options [see Abstract], secondly, Halpen specifically teaches user interface particularly installing various software packages or downloading required software packages [see col 5, line 41-44], further Halpern specifically teaches "self-extracting" executable programs and data files for example as detailed in col 6, line 47-52 . Thirdly, Halpern specifically teaches "auto-start" feature for installing selected software programs, i.e. installing files via user interface template as detailed in col 3, line 42-49, fig 1. Therefore, Halpern specifically teaches user interface allows receiving an input file from a user-enabled electronic device to be used in crating a self-extracting file.

b) At page 13, claim 1, applicant argues Halpern's input file is not disclosed to be automatically launched upon execution of the self-extracting file. Rather, running the client installer is apparently a separate process.

As to be above argument [b], examiner disagree with the applicant because Halpern specifically teaches not only user interface that allows "auto launch" or auto-start" feature, but also teaches self-extractor process as clearly detailed in col 3, line 23-25, col 3, line 62-67, col 4, line 1-5, col 6, line 47-52.

c) At page 14, claim 1, application argues "creation of a self-extracting file is not disclosed to be performed without further action by the user enable device because Halpern requires selection of a plurality of components and options within the user interface U1-1,U1-2, or U1-3. And the self-extracting file is not disclosed to launch the input file automatically upon execution of the self-extraction.

As to the above argument[c], examiner disagree with the applicant because as explained in the argument [a-b], Halpern specifically teaches "auto-launch" or auto-start" function that allows user enabled device to performed without further action from the user, while it is noted that Halpern supports multiple user interface temples such as U1-1,U2-2 and like allows installing files via user interface template as detailed in col 3, line 42-49, fig 1.

d) At page 14, claim 2, applicant argues Halpern does not disclose naming a self-extracting file based in part on the file name of a received input file

As to the argument [d], examiner disagree with the applicant because, Halpern specifically teaches filenames for self-extracting files is part of the program and data files for example as detailed in col 6, line 49-50.

e) At page 14-15, claim 3, page 16-17, claim 26, applicant argues "Halpern does not disclose that any of the interface templates U1-1,U1-2, or U1-3 include selection of an input file for compression.....Finally, as described in conjunction with claim 1, Halpern also does not disclose an input file being automatically launched upon execution of a self-extracting file.

As to the above argument [e], examiner disagree with the applicant because as explained in the above arguments of claim 1, Halpern specifically teaches not only multiple user interface templates allows installing files via user interface template as detailed in col 3, line 42-49, fig 1 particularly "auto-launch" function to perform self-extracting files [col 6, line 47-52, but also teaches "compression process" of files to create a compressed installation for example as detailed in col 7, line 39-45, as noted from Halpern, PKUNZIP is a software tool for compression/archiving files is part of Halpern's teaching [col 1, line 33-39, col 4, line 9-12, col 7, line 39-41].

f) At page 15, claims 4-7, applicant argues "since Halpern does not disclose creating a self-extracting file from only a single action, it also does not disclose the types of single actions by a user recited by claims 4-7,…"

As to the above argument [f], Examiner applies above discussed arguments, further, Halpern specifically teaches "single action" using computer pointing device is part of input for example as detailed in col 1, line 33-37, col 4, line 66-67, and col 5, line 1-7].

Examiner applies above argument to claim 8.

g) At page 15, claim 9, applicant argues, "claim 9 recites generating a file name for the self-extracting file ……..

as to the above argument [g], Halpern specifically teaches generating "self-extracting file" and identified by specific extension of files for example as detailed col 1, line 25-44, col 2, line 28-29, col 6, line 47-60

As to the claim 10 as amended, claim 20, 26, 32, examiner applies argument of claim 1 as discussed above.

h) At page 17, claim 27, applicant argues, Hhalpern does not disclose an input file being automatically decompressed and launched upon execution of an executable file. Halpern also does not disclose receiving an input file in response to a single action. Accordingly, Halpern does not disclose all the limitations of claim 27…

As to the above argument [h], examiner applies arguments of claim 1,and claim 3, further, it is noted that Halpern specifically teaches compression and decompression of files for example using commands for PKUNZIP or a similar decompression utility as detailed in col 1, line 33-44, col 3, line 62-67, col 4, line 1-2, line 9-12].

As to page 17, claim 31-33, examiner applies claim 1, 3 and claim 27 arguments.

i) At page 18-19, Claim 21, applicant argues Wygodny does not disclose displaying a first frame used to allow a user to specify an input file to be converted to a self-extracting file, does not disclose automatically configuring an input file specified by the user as a self-extracting file and does not disclose displaying a second frame that includes a link related to a self-extracting file created from the user specified input file"

As to the above argument [i], examiner disagree with the applicant because, Wygodny teaches user interface particularly displaying windows frame with different panes that allows user to view, edit or use commands to do required functions for example analyzing or execution of file and like as detailed in col 8, line 51-55, col 17, line 1-7, fig 3A, fig 9-10, further Wygondny also teaches self-extracting files, more specifically, self extracting zip files automatically configured and executed or launched as detailed in col 17, line 1-12, ine 21=23, line 33-41, line 43-47, fig 10-11. It is noted that , Wygodny

teaches displaying window divided into multiple frames [fig 3A], and frame element 314 specifically containing self-extracting file for example frame 314 containing link related multiple self-extracting files [fig 3A-3B,fig 5, col 17, line 1-7, line 49-56 , it reads on the limitation displaying a second frame wherein the second frame ……user specified input file

j) At page 19-20, claim 22, applicant argues Waygodny does not disclose a naming module wherein an out filename is generated from the associated filename of the input file".

As to the above argument [j], as best understood by the examiner Wygodny teaches user interface allows to create and execute files particularly input files and file names corresponds to executable files as detailed in fig 3A, col 9, line 9-13, line 57-62 and naming module is integral part of input files, further it is noted that during the interactively generated process, the analyzer displays various data structure items such as modules, directories, source files and like as detailed in col 10, line 63-67 corresponds to input file from the receiving modules are displayed. Wygodny also specifically teaches self-extracting executable files received from the file selection window [col 16, line 39-44] corresponds to self-extracting module receives the input file and the out file from the naming module

Examiner applies above argument to claim 23.

k) At page 20-21, claim 25, applicant argues "in contrast, and as discussed above with respect the rejections of claim 1 and 3, Halpern neither discloses nor renders obvious a loader operable to launch a decompressed input data portion with appropriate application software for handing an input data file"……neither Halpern nor Gage, either alone or in combination disclose or reasonably suggest the limitations of claim 25.

In response to applicant's argument [k], against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413,208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091,231 USPQ 375 (Fed.Cir.1986). As discussed above in Claim 1,3 (supra). Halpern specifically teaches user interface allows receiving an input file from a user-enabled electronic device to be used in crating a self-extracting file, further Halpern also teches compression/decompression of files [col 1, line 33-39]. It is also noted that Gage also teaches user interface allows to choose files, links and file downloading and like, further teaches "compression/decompression of files [col 10, line 43-50] . Therefore, based on Halpern in view of Gage, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Gage to the system for archive header to include compressed file information in order to provide or display respective message to the user

Examiner applies above augments to claims 28-30 and claim 34

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

a. US Patent No. ***6282711***

b. US Patent No. ***5923846***

c. US Patent No. ***6202199***

43. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-4108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam, Hosain, T, can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

/Srirama Channavajjala/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2166.